

THE ARCADE RAILWAY.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE BILL.

A HEARING BEFORE THE GOVERNOR—ADDRESSES FOR AND AGAINST THE MEASURE.

ALBANY, May 9.—The Broadway real estate owners made an imposing demonstration against the Arcade railroad scheme before the Governor this afternoon. The executive chamber was filled with them. The Governor, who sat at his table, was fairly hemmed in by the multitude. In the throng could be seen the faces of many prominent merchants, lawyers and bankers of New-York.

Albion P. Man, of Man & Parsons, headed the delegation, as the representatives of the Lorillard, the Wetmorens and the Ely estates. Among the delegation were E. S. Jaffray, Stephen P. Nash, Lloyd Aspinwall, F. W. J. Hurst, William D. Sloane, of W. & J. Sloane, S. Van Rensselaer, Cruger, Congressman Orlando B. Potter, Amos F. Enis, Charles A. Peabody, General Steinmetz, Senators Robb and Newbold and Assemblyman Howe. There were present to defend the bill, Melville C. Smith, president of the Broadway Underground Railway Company, ex-Governor Gilbert C. Walker, of Virginia, John I. Davenport, Simon E. Church and Lawson N. Fuller.

Mr. Man opened the hearing by presenting a paper signed by a large proportion of the property owners in Broadway protesting against the bill becoming a law. This paper contained the signatures of Henry Hilton, as representative of Mrs. A. T. Stewart, of John Jacob Astor, John A. Stewart, Pierre Lorillard, Jacob Lorillard, L. Lorillard, James F. Kernochan, William Dowd, William E. Dodge, Amos F. Enis, S. H. Higgins, F. S. Winston, and of the representatives of Trinity and Grace churches and the prominent banks and insurance offices.

STEPHEN P. NASH'S OBJECTIONS.

Stephen P. Nash, the representative of the Trinity Church corporation, then argued that the bill was unconstitutional. Under the guise of an amendment to the charter of a railroad granted in 1873, it attempted to override the provisions of the constitutional amendment of 1875, prohibiting the granting of special charters. It sought exclusive privileges. The property the company would affect by its operations between the City Hall and Fourteenth-st., was worth \$100,000,000, while from Park Place to the Battery property worth \$500,000,000 would be endangered. There was no security for the owners of this property in the bill. An indemnity fund of only \$100,000 was required. Three eminent engineers had informed the Trinity Church corporation that the construction of a railroad along Broadway would endanger the tower of the church. The property owners, Mr. Nash said, had no opportunity before the Legislative committee to show the danger to their property that would follow the construction of the road, nor was a chance given them of showing the impracticability of the scheme. The company asked amazing rights—power, for one thing, to remove gas and water pipes. No part of its capital work was required to be paid in before the construction of the road was begun. The restraining power of the three commissioners named in the bill amounted only to authorizing them to report in writing to the Mayor of a violation of its duties by the company.

DANGER TO PROPERTY.

The company would obstruct the streets during the construction of its road. All dirt would have to be removed through side streets. Travel would be interrupted. If constructed under general law, the constitutional provisions would be enforced, requiring the consent of a majority in value of the property owners before the road could be built. A deposit of sufficient security would also have to be made. The bill provided for the excavation of the whole surface of Broadway between the house lines, with sidewalks ten feet below the surface. The main road was not limited except at Canal-st. and the depth was not limited except at Canal-st. The company might change the grade of Broadway without giving any protection to property owners. The company had a right to leave open a space for ventilation not exceeding six feet in width and of unlimited height above the house lines, with side walls, which would cut off access to property, except as the company might deem proper, and would curtail the sidewalks. The excavations being unlimited, might undermine the buildings on Broadway. There was a possibility of unlimited damage to property with no liability for the company. The running of trains would cause a noise and reverberation which would make buildings useless for business purposes.

SAMUEL E. LYON, representative of the Hamilton estate, argued that the bill was unconstitutional, and did not give sufficient protection to property owners.

JOHN E. DEVELIN, as representative of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, also stated that the bill was unconstitutional, and that it granted special privileges without any compensation to New-York City, or to property owners.

E. S. JAFFRAY looked at the bill from the business man's point of view. He declared that the men who were endeavoring to get it made a law were doing so merely for speculation. They had no intention of building the road. If the expense, capital and damage to property owners would be beyond calculation.

CONGRESSMAN ORLANDO B. POTTER said that the damage to property, if the bill were passed, would amount to \$300,000,000. He doubted if the owners of the charter intended to build the road. He had been offered a previous charter for \$1,000.

SOME REASONS FOR BUILDING THE ROAD.

EX-GOVERNOR WALKER made a long argument in favor of the bill. He said that its charter could not be impeached. It had been declared valid by the Supreme Court. The bond of \$100,000 was sufficient for the protection of the property owners. The present act merely confirmed, regulated and defined the powers of the railroad company. Capital and unlimited in amount could be obtained to build the road. The construction of the subways from which the company would derive no benefit would cost the corporation \$3,000,000.

T. W. HAMILTON, as representative of the West Side Citizens' Association, appealed to the Governor to sign the bill in order to bring about rapid transit to the north end of the city.

SIMON E. CHURCH, who lives on the West Side, made a similar argument.

MELVILLE C. SMITH said that he was not surprised at the opposition. There was always opposition to anything new in New-York City. The Legislature had shown that it appreciated innovations of value by passing the bill to come to some decision in the idea that building a Broadway would topple into the street while the road was under construction or when trains were run upon it. There would be no danger if there would be actual rapid transit in New-York.

JOHN I. DAVENPORT presented a book which he said contained 10,000 signatures of residents of New-York in favor of the bill.

GENERAL STEINMETZ, as representative of the United States Government, protested against the passage of the bill, declaring that the construction of a railway in Broadway would imperil the last of the city's glory.

THE GOVERNOR, like a judge, listened patiently to all that was said, and then reserved his decision on the bill. He will come to some decision in the coming week before the Legislature adjourns.

(For other railway news see Fifth Page.)

DELAYING THE PUBLIC WORKS REPORT.

THE COMMITTEE UNABLE TO AGREE—ACTION TO BE TAKEN ON MONDAY.

ALBANY, May 9.—The Committee of Cities of the Senate sacrificed their sleep last night in an unsuccessful attempt to come to some agreement on their report concerning the Department of Public Works of New-York. Three Republicans—Gibbs, Lansing and McCarthy—signed Mr. Watrous's draft of a report, slightly modified; three Democrats—Thatcher, Allen and Cullen—signed a report of their own, while Mr. Thompson signed a report of their own, giving his own peculiar interpretation of the testimony against Mr. Thompson.

The members of the committee separated at 2 a. m., convinced that a majority report could not be obtained. A 7-to-2 Senator Gibbs arose to a question of privilege in the Senate, and stated that the Committee on Cities were directed to make their report on the investigation of the Department of Public Works not later than April 25. After the evidence had been taken a careful report had been drawn up by Mr. Whitridge, the counsel of the committee. Yet the committee had been unable to agree. Three of the Democrats had yet declined

their report; one Republican had submitted a report, and three Republicans had signed a report. This report, however, bore no resemblance to the one submitted by the Democratic members that no report should be presented before Monday night. The presentation of the report would, therefore, be postponed until Monday night.

Senator Thatcher, Democrat, said that Senator Gibbs had one of the opponents of the bill, and that he was willing for several days to present a report.

Senator Gibbs, Democrat, said that he was in the position of the "twelfth" jurymen who had to bring over to his own opinion the other eleven. He also would submit a report on Monday night.

LEGISLATION IN THE SENATE.

BROOKLYN BRIDGE MATTERS—INCREASING THE POLICE FORCE.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

ALBANY, May 9.—Senator Murphy's bill making the Brooklyn Bridge free for pedestrians was voted in the Senate to-day. It received only twelve votes, when seven votes were requisite. Senator Daguerre, of the opposition of the bill, said that Brooklyn could not afford such a luxury as a free bridge. Senators Daggett and Jacobs presented bills for the enlargement of Washington-st., Brooklyn, from the Brooklyn Bridge to the City Hall.

Senator Campbell's bill increasing by 500 the number of patrolmen of the Police Department of New-York, was passed by a vote of 63 to 5. Resistance to the bill was made by several New-York members.

Senator Campbell's bill relating to the employment of women and children in manufacturing establishments was made a special order for Monday evening in the Senate.

The Assembly bill providing for the employment of commissioners to inquire into the practicability of storing the lead-weights of the Hudson was ordered to a third reading by the Senate.

The act in relation to the contagious diseases of animals, was passed by the Senate; and also Mr. Stewart, of John Jacob Astor, John A. Stewart, Pierre Lorillard, Jacob Lorillard, L. Lorillard, James F. Kernochan, William Dowd, William E. Dodge, Amos F. Enis, S. H. Higgins, F. S. Winston, and of the representatives of Trinity and Grace churches and the prominent banks and insurance offices.

STEPHEN P. NASH'S OBJECTIONS.

Stephen P. Nash, the representative of the Trinity Church corporation, then argued that the bill was unconstitutional. Under the guise of an amendment to the charter of a railroad granted in 1873, it attempted to override the provisions of the constitutional amendment of 1875, prohibiting the granting of special charters. It sought exclusive privileges. The property the company would affect by its operations between the City Hall and Fourteenth-st., was worth \$100,000,000, while from Park Place to the Battery property worth \$500,000,000 would be endangered. There was no security for the owners of this property in the bill. An indemnity fund of only \$100,000 was required. Three eminent engineers had informed the Trinity Church corporation that the construction of a railroad along Broadway would endanger the tower of the church. The property owners, Mr. Nash said, had no opportunity before the Legislative committee to show the danger to their property that would follow the construction of the road, nor was a chance given them of showing the impracticability of the scheme. The company asked amazing rights—power, for one thing, to remove gas and water pipes. No part of its capital work was required to be paid in before the construction of the road was begun. The restraining power of the three commissioners named in the bill amounted only to authorizing them to report in writing to the Mayor of a violation of its duties by the company.

DANGER TO PROPERTY.

The company would obstruct the streets during the construction of its road. All dirt would have to be removed through side streets. Travel would be interrupted. If constructed under general law, the constitutional provisions would be enforced, requiring the consent of a majority in value of the property owners before the road could be built. A deposit of sufficient security would also have to be made. The bill provided for the excavation of the whole surface of Broadway between the house lines, with sidewalks ten feet below the surface. The main road was not limited except at Canal-st. and the depth was not limited except at Canal-st. The company might change the grade of Broadway without giving any protection to property owners. The company had a right to leave open a space for ventilation not exceeding six feet in width and of unlimited height above the house lines, with side walls, which would cut off access to property, except as the company might deem proper, and would curtail the sidewalks. The excavations being unlimited, might undermine the buildings on Broadway. There was a possibility of unlimited damage to property with no liability for the company. The running of trains would cause a noise and reverberation which would make buildings useless for business purposes.

SAMUEL E. LYON, representative of the Hamilton estate, argued that the bill was unconstitutional, and did not give sufficient protection to property owners.

JOHN E. DEVELIN, as representative of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, also stated that the bill was unconstitutional, and that it granted special privileges without any compensation to New-York City, or to property owners.

E. S. JAFFRAY looked at the bill from the business man's point of view. He declared that the men who were endeavoring to get it made a law were doing so merely for speculation. They had no intention of building the road. If the expense, capital and damage to property owners would be beyond calculation.

CONGRESSMAN ORLANDO B. POTTER said that the damage to property, if the bill were passed, would amount to \$300,000,000. He doubted if the owners of the charter intended to build the road. He had been offered a previous charter for \$1,000.

SOME REASONS FOR BUILDING THE ROAD.

EX-GOVERNOR WALKER made a long argument in favor of the bill. He said that its charter could not be impeached. It had been declared valid by the Supreme Court. The bond of \$100,000 was sufficient for the protection of the property owners. The present act merely confirmed, regulated and defined the powers of the railroad company. Capital and unlimited in amount could be obtained to build the road. The construction of the subways from which the company would derive no benefit would cost the corporation \$3,000,000.

T. W. HAMILTON, as representative of the West Side Citizens' Association, appealed to the Governor to sign the bill in order to bring about rapid transit to the north end of the city.

SIMON E. CHURCH, who lives on the West Side, made a similar argument.

MELVILLE C. SMITH said that he was not surprised at the opposition. There was always opposition to anything new in New-York City. The Legislature had shown that it appreciated innovations of value by passing the bill to come to some decision in the idea that building a Broadway would topple into the street while the road was under construction or when trains were run upon it. There would be no danger if there would be actual rapid transit in New-York.

JOHN I. DAVENPORT presented a book which he said contained 10,000 signatures of residents of New-York in favor of the bill.

GENERAL STEINMETZ, as representative of the United States Government, protested against the passage of the bill, declaring that the construction of a railway in Broadway would imperil the last of the city's glory.

THE GOVERNOR, like a judge, listened patiently to all that was said, and then reserved his decision on the bill. He will come to some decision in the coming week before the Legislature adjourns.

(For other railway news see Fifth Page.)

DELAYING THE PUBLIC WORKS REPORT.

THE COMMITTEE UNABLE TO AGREE—ACTION TO BE TAKEN ON MONDAY.

ALBANY, May 9.—The Committee of Cities of the Senate sacrificed their sleep last night in an unsuccessful attempt to come to some agreement on their report concerning the Department of Public Works of New-York. Three Republicans—Gibbs, Lansing and McCarthy—signed Mr. Watrous's draft of a report, slightly modified; three Democrats—Thatcher, Allen and Cullen—signed a report of their own, while Mr. Thompson signed a report of their own, giving his own peculiar interpretation of the testimony against Mr. Thompson.

The members of the committee separated at 2 a. m., convinced that a majority report could not be obtained. A 7-to-2 Senator Gibbs arose to a question of privilege in the Senate, and stated that the Committee on Cities were directed to make their report on the investigation of the Department of Public Works not later than April 25. After the evidence had been taken a careful report had been drawn up by Mr. Whitridge, the counsel of the committee. Yet the committee had been unable to agree. Three of the Democrats had yet declined

their report; one Republican had submitted a report, and three Republicans had signed a report. This report, however, bore no resemblance to the one submitted by the Democratic members that no report should be presented before Monday night. The presentation of the report would, therefore, be postponed until Monday night.

Senator Thatcher, Democrat, said that Senator Gibbs had one of the opponents of the bill, and that he was willing for several days to present a report.

Senator Gibbs, Democrat, said that he was in the position of the "twelfth" jurymen who had to bring over to his own opinion the other eleven. He also would submit a report on Monday night.

LEGISLATION IN THE SENATE.

BROOKLYN BRIDGE MATTERS—INCREASING THE POLICE FORCE.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

ALBANY, May 9.—Senator Murphy's bill making the Brooklyn Bridge free for pedestrians was voted in the Senate to-day. It received only twelve votes, when seven votes were requisite. Senator Daguerre, of the opposition of the bill, said that Brooklyn could not afford such a luxury as a free bridge. Senators Daggett and Jacobs presented bills for the enlargement of Washington-st., Brooklyn, from the Brooklyn Bridge to the City Hall.

Senator Campbell's bill increasing by 500 the number of patrolmen of the Police Department of New-York, was passed by a vote of 63 to 5. Resistance to the bill was made by several New-York members.

Senator Campbell's bill relating to the employment of women and children in manufacturing establishments was made a special order for Monday evening in the Senate.

The Assembly bill providing for the employment of commissioners to inquire into the practicability of storing the lead-weights of the Hudson was ordered to a third reading by the Senate.

The act in relation to the contagious diseases of animals, was passed by the Senate; and also Mr. Stewart, of John Jacob Astor, John A. Stewart, Pierre Lorillard, Jacob Lorillard, L. Lorillard, James F. Kernochan, William Dowd, William E. Dodge, Amos F. Enis, S. H. Higgins, F. S. Winston, and of the representatives of Trinity and Grace churches and the prominent banks and insurance offices.

STEPHEN P. NASH'S OBJECTIONS.

Stephen P. Nash, the representative of the Trinity Church corporation, then argued that the bill was unconstitutional. Under the guise of an amendment to the charter of a railroad granted in 1873, it attempted to override the provisions of the constitutional amendment of 1875, prohibiting the granting of special charters. It sought exclusive privileges. The property the company would affect by its operations between the City Hall and Fourteenth-st., was worth \$100,000,000, while from Park Place to the Battery property worth \$500,000,000 would be endangered. There was no security for the owners of this property in the bill. An indemnity fund of only \$100,000 was required. Three eminent engineers had informed the Trinity Church corporation that the construction of a railroad along Broadway would endanger the tower of the church. The property owners, Mr. Nash said, had no opportunity before the Legislative committee to show the danger to their property that would follow the construction of the road, nor was a chance given them of showing the impracticability of the scheme. The company asked amazing rights—power, for one thing, to remove gas and water pipes. No part of its capital work was required to be paid in before the construction of the road was begun. The restraining power of the three commissioners named in the bill amounted only to authorizing them to report in writing to the Mayor of a violation of its duties by the company.

DANGER TO PROPERTY.

The company would obstruct the streets during the construction of its road. All dirt would have to be removed through side streets. Travel would be interrupted. If constructed under general law, the constitutional provisions would be enforced, requiring the consent of a majority in value of the property owners before the road could be built. A deposit of sufficient security would also have to be made. The bill provided for the excavation of the whole surface of Broadway between the house lines, with sidewalks ten feet below the surface. The main road was not limited except at Canal-st. and the depth was not limited except at Canal-st. The company might change the grade of Broadway without giving any protection to property owners. The company had a right to leave open a space for ventilation not exceeding six feet in width and of unlimited height above the house lines, with side walls, which would cut off access to property, except as the company might deem proper, and would curtail the sidewalks. The excavations being unlimited, might undermine the buildings on Broadway. There was a possibility of unlimited damage to property with no liability for the company. The running of trains would cause a noise and reverberation which would make buildings useless for business purposes.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA DISASTER.

DR. STEELE'S ACCOUNT OF THE WRECK.

WHY MORE PASSENGERS WERE NOT SAVED—CONDUCT OF THE CAPTAIN.

MONTEAL, May 9.—The State of Florida, which does not know exactly how when the shipwrecked people of the State of Florida will be returned to their homes. The probabilities are, however, that they will be sent direct to Glasgow from Montreal, by either the Donaldson or Allan lines.

Dr. Steele, surgeon of the State of Florida, says the main cause of the great loss of life was the condition of the steamer after the collision. According to this fact that more than 100 passengers were killed, and that the passengers were afraid to enter the lifeboats. The chief engineer appeared to be possessed of the same remarkable coolness or lethargy which distinguished the captain, and as he was hurrying his friends through the passage, which was already knee-deep in water, he met the chief engineer coolly walking up and down with a life-preserver on his head and hands in his pockets.

The men to promise to hold together, as it was only a question of a few minutes before the ship would be a mass of wreckage. The chief engineer was not a grumble was heard from any of them.

TORONTO, May 9.—James H. Bennett, of London, Ont., one of the members of the State of Florida, passed through this city to-day. He was spoken to about the collision. He said it occurred through sheer carelessness. The night was as clear as it possibly could be without moonlight. There was supposed to be on duty a pilot, and he had been told that the steamer had failed seeing the bark, as on board the bark and they saw the steamer's light half an hour before the collision, but were helpless to prevent it.

TALK AMONG LOCAL SEAFARING MEN.

WHAT INSPECTOR BARRETT SAYS ABOUT THE SHIP'S BOATS—REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW.

In the dispatches from Montreal it was stated that the rescued people would be forwarded to New-York, and be due here last night, but Mr. Barrett, one of the agents, said that the people would not be here until such time as the ship was ready to receive them. He said that the ship was in a bad way, and that the captain was a man of no account. He said that the ship was in a bad way, and that the captain was a man of no account. He said that the ship was in a bad way, and that the captain was a man of no account.

THE WRECK OF THE PORTLAND.

PORTLAND, Me., May 9.—A dispatch from the wreck of the steamer City of Portland says it is expected that considerable flour and cotton goods will be saved. The steamer was wrecked on the rocks of the Portland harbor, and the cargo was scattered all over the rocks. It is reported from Portland that the agents have placed the wreck in the hands of wreckers, who will try to save the machinery. Captain Abney, of the revenue cutter Woodbury, says the wrecked steamer was in a bad way, and that the captain was a man of no account.

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The American Medical Association held its last session to-day. Dr. Dalton, Jr., of New-York, from the Committee on Experimental Medicine, reported a resolution empowering the committee to add to its members by the election of associate members from different States, and expressing a conviction that restrictive legislation with regard to experiments on animals would retard the advancement of medical knowledge. The report was adopted.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded to make no recommendation of changes in the medical code for the amendment of the code, which was adopted. He, however, submitted a resolution, which was adopted, that the committee should make a report on the subject of the amendment of the code as early as possible.

Dr. Dalton also reported that he had been informed by some of the members of the committee that he had concluded